





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

L. Talbot

SEQUEL

TO

REMARKS UPON CHURCH REFORM,

2
§c. §c.

SEQUEL

TO

REMARKS UPON CHURCH RÉFORM,

WITH

OBSERVATIONS

UPON

THE PLAN PROPOSED BY LORD HENLEY.

BY THE

REV. EDWARD BURTON, D. D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, CANON OF
CHRISTCHURCH, AND RECTOR OF EWELME.

LONDON :

ROAKE AND VARTY, 31, STRAND,

AND

J. PARKER, OXFORD.

1832.

SEQUEL

TO

REMARKS UPON CHURCH REFORM,

&c. &c.

HAVING been induced, in the course of last year, to publish some Remarks upon Church Reform, I have read with much interest some of the numerous works which have appeared upon the same subject: and it has been a cause of mortification, as well as of surprise, to find that the question has made so little progress, and that no practical plan has yet been attempted. I am bound to add, that the scheme recommended by myself does not appear to have gained many advocates; though I have good reason to think, that the objections have been advanced by persons who have not taken pains to investigate it: and it still appears to me not only practicable, but likely to be more beneficial than any other which has been proposed.

Among the persons, who have expressed themselves decidedly opposed to my suggestions, the first place ought to be given to Lord Henley,

who has lately put forward "A Plan of Church Reform," of which the third edition is now lying before me. This rapidity of sale is a sufficient proof of the popularity of the work: and though many persons have denounced the plan as "mischievous," I could never suffer myself to apply the term to a work which is written in such a Christian spirit, and with such a sincere regard to the best interests of religion. If all persons would approach the subject of Church Reform with the same feelings as Lord Henley, there would be nothing to apprehend from discussion and disagreement. We might differ as to the best mode of accomplishing the object; but we should be agreed in endeavouring to reform the Church, so as to make it produce the most good, and to render the greatest service to the souls and bodies of men. This is the definition which was given of Church Reform in my former publication; and I feel convinced that there is no difference between Lord Henley and myself upon this point. I also ventured to say, that the first object to be accomplished is the augmentation of small livings: and though Lord Henley has dwelt upon many other points as being of primary importance, he is fully impressed with the necessity of increasing small livings; and this is in fact the principal part of the scheme which he has given in detail. It will be my object, in the present remarks, to point out the impracticability of his Lordship's plan: after which I shall explain at

greater length the scheme recommended by myself; and endeavour to shew, upon principles acknowledged by Lord Henley, that it is not only free from the objections which he brings against it, but that it would be much more effective than his own plan in preventing the abuses which he deploues.

To those who have not read Lord Henley's pamphlet, I would state in a few words, that he proposes to invest all the property, now belonging to Bishops and Chapters, in the hands of Commissioners. All the present sees are to be retained; and two new Bishops, not being Lords of Parliament, are to be appointed. The Chapters of all the Cathedrals are to be entirely remodelled. A Dean and two Chaplains are to perform the daily service in each cathedral, and the stalls are either to be annexed to livings situated within the city, or (where this cannot be effected) to be suppressed altogether. The sum of money, which will remain, after paying these several functionaries, is to be applied to the augmentation and improvement of the smaller benefices.

Lord Henley assumes the aggregate of the episcopal revenues to be 163,000*l. per annum*: and since his own scheme, though altering the incomes of individuals, would make the whole payment to the Bishops amount to precisely the same sum, I need not at present take any notice of this part of the plan. The augmentation of small livings,

which I have stated to be my leading object, would not be effected by this new distribution of the revenues of the Bishops.

Lord Henley gives two calculations concerning the property of Deans and Chapters, and of Collegiate Churches. Dr. Cove estimated it some years ago at 275,000*l. per annum*. Mr. Rose has more recently stated it to be 300,000*l.* Lord Henley has adopted the latter sum as the basis of his own calculations; and for the present we will assume it to be correct. Out of this sum he proposes to apply 52,600*l.* to the stipends of the Deans and their Chaplains; and 100,000*l. per annum* to the maintenance of those stalls which are still to be retained. The remainder, which may be called in round numbers 150,000*l.*, is to be devoted to the augmentation of small livings.

The plan, as thus stated, is extremely attractive. It seems likely to accomplish, and with great rapidity, the removal of that blot in our establishment, the great inequality of benefices: and if Lord Henley could really produce the sum of 150,000*l.* which would annually be available for such a purpose, I would say nothing of his purchasing the benefit by the sacrifice of so many ancient establishments. It is true, that Lord Henley does not actually reckon upon having so large a sum at his disposal: and his own pamphlet furnishes materials for making most alarming deductions; but still he has not given the amount of

these deductions : and in one place (p. 40.), he distinctly states that the residue “ will amount to about the annual sum of 150,000*l.*” Unfortunately for the augmentation of small benefices, it will appear upon investigation, that this ample residue will be reduced almost to nothing, as may be seen by the following considerations.

The fifteenth section in Lord Henley’s plan provides, “ that the following payments be made by the corporation out of the funds so vested in them : viz. the stipends of the several ecclesiastical persons as fixed by the Act ; the salaries of the Commissioners and other officers, and the expenses of carrying the Act into execution, as specially directed by it ; the repair of Cathedrals, and of those Churches, of which the property is hereby vested in the corporation ; the expenses of Choirs and other charges attendant on Divine Service ; and also the repairs of the Palaces and Residences of such ecclesiastical persons.”

I will take each of these clauses in their order, omitting the first, which has no reference to the sum now under consideration. With respect to the salaries of Commissioners and other officers, it is provided in Section IV. that there shall be eight Commissioners who receive pay ; and in Section VI. that there shall be an Accountant-General with a certain number of clerks : and it would not, perhaps, be extravagant to fix the expense of these salaries at 5,000*l. per annum.* This sum shall be taken to include the whole expense of the machinery of the board,

though many other *items* might be named: and thus the sum of 5,000*l.* is to be deducted from the 150,000*l.* I shall say nothing of “the expenses of carrying the Act into execution,” which though extremely heavy would occur only once.

The next *item* is “the repair of Cathedrals, and of those Churches, of which the property is hereby vested in the corporation.” I have procured returns of the sums actually laid out upon the repair of eleven cathedrals; and they give an average of 1,042*l. per annum.* This average is below the sum which is laid out annually upon some of our largest and most venerable Cathedrals: but it is too high as a general calculation. I cannot, however, venture to reduce it, when I consider the contingency of such events as the fires at Westminster Abbey and York Minster, or the falling of the west-end of Hereford Cathedral. These calamities are now met by a large temporary sacrifice on the part of the Chapter. For several years the sum devoted to repairs greatly exceeds the usual average: and such cases must be expected not unfrequently, out of a number of thirty-two Cathedrals. The board of Commissioners would then be obliged to defray the whole expense. The incomes of the Deans and the few remaining prebendaries being reduced to a settled stipend, it could not be expected that they would come forward as before, and take the burthen upon themselves. Even if they had the wish, they would not have the means.

The Commissioners would frequently be called upon for a sudden and extraordinary repair, to the amount of several thousand pounds : and I cannot, therefore, venture to put this item of expense at less than what appears to be the average of ordinary repairs. It would probably greatly exceed it : but I will put it at the sum of 1,000*l.* which will bring the repair of thirty-two Cathedrals to 32,000*l. per annum.*

Lord Henley also provides for the repair of “ those Churches, of which the property is hereby vested in the corporation :” and though he does not calculate the number of these Churches, we may form some estimate of them by the provisions in Section XXXI. which orders “ that the corporation shall take an account of all the livings in the gift of the several Chapters aforesaid, situated within the cities where such Chapters are.” These livings are in future to be in the gift of the corporation : and according to the provisions in Section XV. the Churches are to be kept in repair by the funds at the disposal of the corporation. I have taken some pains in ascertaining the number of these Churches ; and I find that there are rather more than one hundred livings in cathedral towns, which are in the gift of the respective Deans and Chapters. Lord Henley would increase the number of them : for the same Section XXXI. gives a power “ to annex other livings within such cities to such stalls :” but I will estimate them only at one hundred : and the repair of one hundred Churches,

when we reckon for extraordinary contingencies, can hardly be put at less than 25*l.* a piece, or in all 2,500*l. per annum*: which sum, when added to the 32,000*l.* which would be required for the repair of thirty-two Cathedrals, will amount to 34,500*l. per annum*: and this must be deducted from the residue of 150,000*l.*

The next *item* contains “the expenses of Choirs and other charges attendant on Divine Service:” and since it is distinctly stated in Section XXXIII. that the cathedral service is to be continued “in like manner as has heretofore been done,” we must calculate the expense of an organist, singing men, choristers, vergers, &c. &c. in all the cathedrals. There are now twenty-five Cathedrals, in which there is daily choral service. Lord Henley’s establishment contains thirty-two Cathedrals: and whoever is acquainted with these matters, will know that the choirs of thirty-two Cathedrals would be very cheaply served for 10,000*l. per annum*: and this sum is also to include the “other charges attendant on divine service.”

The last *item* in this section refers to “the repairs of the palaces and residences of such ecclesiastical persons.” Here I am obliged to take the Bishops into my calculations; for though the sum of 163,000*l.*, as it is now divided among the Bishops, is able also to keep their houses in repair, the same sum, when distributed according to the equalizing system, is found to be insufficient for that purpose. Lord Henley accordingly proposes, that the expense

of repairing the episcopal houses should be paid by the board of Commissioners, i. e. out of his residue of 150,000*l.* His scheme comprehends twenty-eight Bishops; and when we consider the size and antiquity of some of their residences, their annual repair will not be rated highly at 5000*l.* But Lord Henley also provides for repairing the houses of all the ecclesiastical persons mentioned in the Act. These persons consist of thirty-two Deans, sixty-four Chaplains, and a certain number of Canons or Prebendaries, who, according to the provisions already cited from Section XXXI. will be at least one hundred; so that we have one hundred and ninety-six houses to be kept in repair by the board of Commissioners in addition to the residences of the Bishops. The sum of 7000*l.* is not too large to be devoted to this purpose: and we must thus deduct 12,000*l.* from the residue of 150,000*l.*

The next clause which we have to notice, is one of great liberality on the part of Lord Henley, but which is very fatal to his residue of 150,000*l.* In Section XXIV. it is provided, “That every Bishop shall, once in every year, hold a Visitation in his Diocese, and that every Archdeacon shall, once in every year, visit every parish in his Archdeaconry: and that the expenses of such Visitations be paid by the Corporation to Bishops and Archdeacons, according to a rate of per mile for travelling expenses, and per day for other disbursements.” I am not versed in settling the travelling expenses of Bishops and Archdeacons: but the

Barristers, who are to visit their political dioceses under the Reform Bill, are to be paid “ at the rate of five guineas for every day they shall be so employed, over and above their travelling and other expenses.” This may, perhaps, furnish a precedent for Archbishops and Bishops: and we may reasonably allow them at the rate of four shillings a mile for travelling. If we take one diocese with another, each Bishop must perform his visitations rapidly to finish them in four days, and we may suppose them to travel fifty miles a day: this will require a sum of 1708*l.* without allowing anything for “ other expenses.” With respect to the Archdeacons, I will not institute a comparison between the importance of their labours and those of the registering Barristers; but as Lawyers charge much more for their time than the Clergy, instead of giving the Archdeacons five guineas a day, we will only give them half that sum, and two shillings a mile for travelling expenses. The Archdeacons must consume many more days in their visitations than the Bishops, since they are to visit every parish in their Archdeaconry once in every year. There are now sixty Archdeacons: and since there are 10,000 parishes, each Archdeacon must visit on the average, one hundred and sixty-six churches. It is scarcely possible to visit more than four churches in one day, so that each Archdeacon will employ at least forty-one days in his visitation. The distance travelled by him each day will be less than that travelled by the Bishops: perhaps he will not exceed

twenty miles a day; and the expenses of the sixty Archdeacons will be found, upon this very moderate scale, to amount to 11,377*l.*; and this must be deducted from the residue of 150,000*l.*

The next article also furnishes a very heavy deduction: but it is so heavy, that I scarcely know how to proceed in my calculations, lest I should appear to wish to reduce this unfortunate residue improperly. Lord Henley shall speak for himself. He says, in Section XXV.—“That where any Archbishop, Bishop, or the Incumbent of any Benefice, having a population of 1500 souls, shall become permanently incapacitated, by age or infirmities, from discharging the duties of his office; or shall, after fifteen years’ service therein, have attained the age of seventy years, such person shall be entitled, upon resigning such preferment, to receive a pension equal to one half of the stipend thereof, provided such pension shall not exceed 3000*l. per annum*, except the Archbishop of Canterbury, who shall be entitled to a retiring pension of 4000*l. per annum*.” It will, perhaps, be conceded, that this clause will be worse than nugatory, unless it be made imperative, that each of the persons mentioned in it, shall resign his preferment upon attaining the age of seventy. To make the resignation optional, or dependent on the judgment of the Commissioners, would be such an inconvenient and invidious proceeding, that the rule must either be invariable, or not exist at all. I believe that

there are now at least seven persons on the Episcopal Bench, who have reached the age of 70; and when the number of Bishops is raised to twenty-eight, this must always be expected. The retiring pensions of these seven persons would amount at least to 21,000*l.*

With respect to the Incumbents of Benefices having a population of 1500 souls, it is difficult to calculate their number accurately; but the livings in the patronage of the University of Oxford will, perhaps, enable us to form a tolerable estimate. The number of these livings is 426, of which there are 68 with a population of 1500 souls :* so that out of the 10,000 livings in England and Wales, we may suppose that there are 1596 with a population of 1500 souls. Some of these 426 livings being chapelries, or small perpetual curacies, there are only 400 incumbents: and I find that 19 of these incumbents were presented to their livings before the year 1790: and we may fairly assume, that they are now 70 years old.† If we follow this proportion, there will be 75 of the 1596 incumbents entitled to the retiring pension, which is to equal one half of the stipend of the preferment: and when we consider the plan which is proposed for raising

* This is according to the census of 1821: so that now there are probably more than 68 livings with 1500 souls.

† If we take the average length of a clergyman's life, it is probable that there will be more than 19 clergymen out of 400, who have reached the age of 70.

the value of all benefices, we ought not to place this retiring pension at less than 300*l. per annum*. The whole sum, therefore, which will be paid in pensions to superannuated incumbents, will be 22,500*l.*; which, added to the pensions of the Bishops, will amount to 43,500*l.*; and this must be deducted from the residue of 150,000*l.*

The next *item* is one of small amount, when compared with the two last. It is in Section XXXII. where it is provided,—“That, in those cases where Chapter preferment is now attached to Professorships, or Heads of Houses, upon the death or removal of the present possessor, the future holder shall receive an annual payment from the Corporation, equal to the average of the last three years.” If we may judge from the University of Oxford, this payment will amount to about 3000*l. per annum*, which is to be deducted from the residue of 150,000*l.*

I have now gone through all the *items* of expense which are to be defrayed by the Board of Commissioners. If I had been anxious to swell the aggregate of these expenses, I might have named many other sums. For instance, Lord Henley proposes in Section VII. “that a commission be appointed to inquire into the best means of giving efficiency to the *Convocation* :” and since it would be absolutely impossible for the Bishops and Clergy to defray the expenses attendant upon a session of convocation, the money must be paid

by the Board of Commissioners or by the country. The expense to which the country is put by Mr. Hume alone for printed returns, would ruin the Board of Commissioners in one year, and I shall therefore say nothing more about it. It will be remembered, that the whole sum which Lord Henley has to deal with is 300,000*l.* Out of this sum, the Deans and other Clergymen are to receive 150,000*l.*, or to speak more correctly, 152,600*l.* The remainder is 147,400*l.*, and this is the fund intended for the augmentation of small livings.

But we have seen, that Lord Henley has himself specified several other payments, which are to be made out of this fund, before any part of it is applied to the augmentation of small livings. These payments are as follow :

Salaries of Commissioners	£5000
Repairs of Cathedrals	32,000
————— Churches :	2,500
Choirs, &c.	10,000
Repairs of Bishops' Palaces	5,000
————— Clergymen's Houses	7,000
Bishops' Visitations	1,708
Archdeacons' Visitations	11,377
Bishops' Pensions	21,000
Clergymen's Pensions	22,500
Professors and Heads of Houses	3,000
	<hr/>
	£121,085

It appears, therefore, that instead of a residue of

150,000*l.* as Lord Henley has assumed, the Commissioners will only have 26,315*l.* for the augmentation of small livings. If any person will take the trouble to examine the calculations I have made, he will find that they are taken on a very moderate scale; and I feel convinced, that if Lord Henley's scheme was actually to be tried with all its provisions, the Commissioners would scarcely have any surplus at all for the augmentation of small livings. If it should turn out, that Mr. Rose has exaggerated the amount of cathedral property, and that Dr. Cove was right in estimating it only at 275,000*l. per annum*, the residue would amount to little more than 1000*l.* The Commissioners would probably be bankrupts in the first year of their managing the concern: or even if they were not, the sum would not be as great as that which now arises from the fund called Queen Anne's Bounty. With respect to the two calculations of Dr. Cove and Mr. Rose, it is difficult to decide as to their relative correctness. Lord Henley, when speaking of the Chapters, says, "The number of dignitaries is usually stated at 600, with stipends varying from mere nominal sums to incomes of very large amount;" and this statement might make it appear not improbable, that the total revenues of the whole body amount to 300,000*l. per annum*. But the accuracy of the passage just quoted may perhaps be doubted. If the term "dignitary" be limited, as it generally is, to Deans and Residentiaries, the whole number of

dignitaries, instead of being 600, cannot be raised to 230. I have taken some pains to ascertain the annual incomes of these persons, and I am confident that in several instances the calculation exceeds the truth. It may be said to amount to something less than 200,000*l.* : so that if the income of the whole body is equal to 300,000*l.*, as Mr. Rose has stated,* we must suppose a sum exceeding 100,000*l.* to be divided annually between other persons belonging to the cathedral, or to be made up from the property of other collegiate churches : a supposition which appears rather improbable. Mr. Rose has perhaps calculated *the gross receipts* of the different chapters ; in which case, his statement may probably be not far from the truth. But Lord Henley has reckoned upon the sum of 300,000*l.* as being clear without any deductions besides those specified by himself. He is perhaps not aware of the expenses attending every renewal of a lease. Large sums are paid every seven or fourteen years for surveys of estates. Chapters, like other landlords, have many drawbacks in settling with their tenants : and if the Commissioners of Lord Henley's board had a nominal rental of 300,000*l.* they would find it grievously reduced, before they began to appropriate the money. The drawbacks would amount to at least the surplus of 26,315*l.* and there would in fact be no surplus at all.

* Mr. Rose's expression is "*under 300,000*l.* :*" which is altered by Lord Henley to "*about 300,000*l.**"

The question now presents itself, whether it is worth while to make this great change in our ecclesiastical establishment, for the chance of having 26,315*l.* *per annum* for the augmentation of small livings. Without dwelling on the smallness of this sum, and the uncertainty of its existence, there are objections to the scheme itself, which would incline me to look out for some better mode of effecting the same objects. In the first place, I cannot think that the Deans will be made more efficient, either as members of society, or as ministers of religion, by being confined for nine months in the year to perform the daily service in their cathedrals. But this is a point, upon which I shall say more hereafter. Another objection arises out of a circumstance, which is likely to have escaped the knowledge of Lord Henley, but which a member of a Chapter cannot well pass over. I may say with truth, that scarcely a month elapses, in which the Chapter, to which I belong, does not receive an application from some place in which it happens to have property. The parish church is to be rebuilt or repaired, a churchyard is to be enlarged, an organ is to be erected, a school is to be established, or some other good work of this kind is contemplated; and the Chapter, as receiving the great tithes, or as having property in the parish, is applied to for its subscription. I am quite sure, that Lord Henley would not wish these sources of charity to be dried up: but such would inevitably be

the case, if all the cathedral property was vested in the hands of Commissioners. There is now a natural connexion between the two parties. The application is perhaps not always attended to : but still a considerable sum of money is expended in this way : and if all the cathedral property in England was managed by one board, it is quite certain that claims of charity on such an extended scale could not be listened to. The objection which is now made to tithes being paid to persons who are not resident in the parish, would still be felt, but with increased force. At present there is some portion, however small, which returns now and then in the shape of a charitable subscription : but Lord Henley's scheme would put an end to all such benefactions : and I feel confident that he is not aware of the injury which would be caused in this way by the new arrangement.

These and other objections might perhaps appear of minor importance, if they were the necessary result of an extensive plan for augmenting the smaller livings : but when we bear in mind, that all these changes would be made, and that little or no benefit would accrue to the smaller livings, we ought perhaps to pause, before we try an experiment, which has so little practical good to recommend it.

It may be said, in answer to this, that the benefit would be immense, if pluralities, sinecures, the inequality of benefices, and all such evils, are re-

moved from our Church Establishment. I would be the first to assent to this proposition : and it is with some unwillingness that I venture to assert, that Lord Henley's scheme, properly so called, does not provide for the removal of any one of these evils. Lord Henley would wish to see them removed, and so would every sincere friend to religion and the Church. But Lord Henley knows as well as I do, that there is one preliminary step, which must precede his reform : a step, over which he has no control : but without which he cannot put the smallest particle of his scheme into practice. I allude to the patronage of Church Preferment, and particularly to that which belongs to the Crown. I am aware of the difficulty under which Lord Henley writes, and can fully understand his feelings, when he said at page 56, "There is one remaining point, which, though not made the subject of any specific proposal in the following plan, is yet so deeply connected with the purity of the Church, that it would be improper to omit all notice of it, though the time is not yet arrived when we can hope for any legislative enactment respecting it. It relates to the mode of disposing of the Crown Patronage." This declaration is sufficiently discouraging. Lord Henley had said at page 34, "It is clear from what has been already premised, that the augmentation of small Livings, and the endowment of Churches in poor and populous places, can only

be effected by the application of some portion of cathedral property." This is, in fact, the foundation of his Lordship's whole scheme. Unless the Crown will give up its patronage of preferment in cathedrals, he cannot execute any one of the thirty-four provisions contained in his plan: and yet he says, in the passage quoted above, "that the time is not yet arrived, when we can hope for any legislative enactment respecting it!"

This, then, is the real state of the question: not whether Lord Henley's is a good scheme for abolishing pluralities, sinecures, and all such evils; but whether, supposing them to be abolished by an alteration of patronage, it would then be advisable to apply his Lordship's scheme. This view of the case will materially assist us in coming to an agreement upon the question of Church Reform. I perfectly agree with Lord Henley in condemning pluralities, non-residence, sinecures, &c. &c. I should rejoice to see some legislative enactment, by which such evils would be rendered impossible. We are both agreed in thinking the augmentation of small livings an indispensable preliminary to real reform: so that, in fact, there is scarcely any difference between us, except as to the best mode of raising a fund for this purpose. I have endeavoured to shew that Lord Henley would not raise the sum which he has calculated. The scheme which I am about to develope, will produce a much larger sum; and though I am

equally anxious with Lord Henley to see an alteration in the Crown Patronage, it will be observed that my plan might exist without it, whereas that of Lord Henley cannot be applied, till the preferment in the gift of the Crown is placed at his disposal.

In my former pamphlet I mentioned the outline of the plan which I would propose. It is, that all benefices of a certain amount should pay an annual tax, which should form a fund for the improvement of the smaller livings. I perhaps expressed myself incautiously on the subject of tenths; and many persons have taken fright, as if it was intended that every living should pay a tenth of its actual annual income. Nothing was farther from my thoughts than such a proposal. Though I expressed myself favourable to the plan of making the payment of tenths "more real than it is at present," I added, "there is, perhaps, no virtue or charm in the number ten. A graduated scale might be agreed upon; and every living above a certain value, as well as preferment in cathedrals, might be taxed according to its income." This passage occurred in the first edition of my pamphlet: and having found that many persons misunderstood my meaning, I added a postscript to the second edition, in which I disclaimed the notion of wishing to enforce a payment of actual tenths.

Still, however, I find that many persons de-

nounce any scheme of this sort as impracticable and unjust: and it is with great regret that I extract the following passage from Lord Henley's pamphlet:—"When this subject was considered so long ago as the year 1810, Lord Harrowby, in a very valuable pamphlet on the Augmentation of Poor Livings, adduced reasons in opposition to this scheme, which ought to have set the agitation of it at rest for ever. Besides the important consideration of the hardship of it, he shewed clearly that it would be an act of gross injustice. When nearly three centuries have elapsed, during which this tax has been considered as invariable, when so large a number of livings have become private property, and have passed for a valuable consideration from one purchaser to another on the faith of the invariability of this tax, a fresh valuation, for the purpose of increasing the tax, would be an arbitrary seizure of vested estates, in order to throw upon a particular class of proprietors that burthen which ought to be borne in common." I have not been able to meet with Lord Harrowby's pamphlet: but from the account given of it by Lord Henley, I suspect that this part of it must have been directed against a scheme essentially different from mine. I am at a loss to conceive, that Lord Harrowby could have seen any injustice in taking a small sum from the large livings, even when they belonged to private patrons. When the preferment is in the gift of the Crown, or of

Chapters, or other Corporations, there is not even a shadow of ground for the argument of injustice : no “ valuable consideration ” has been paid for such benefices : and with respect to stalls in Cathedrals, Lord Henley, so far from feeling any scruple in taxing them, would not hesitate to remodel or extinguish them. The argument is, therefore, entirely confined to the large livings in the hands of private patrons : and I am surprised to find that Lord Harrowby would think it unjust to diminish, in a small degree, the value of this kind of patronage. We are indebted for what is commonly called the Curates’ Bill to the exertions of Lord Harrowby. I am aware that the bill was opposed at first by many excellent persons : but I believe that the opposition has given way to almost general approval ; and my own opinion was always decidedly in favour of it. Still, however, it is a bill which interfered very materially with the rights, or rather with the customs, of private patronage, and with what are called “ vested interests.” The sale of small livings has been greatly affected by that bill. The argument used by Lord Henley might equally serve to prove not only “ the hardship,” but “ the gross injustice ” of the Curates’ Bill : and though I am quite certain that he would not argue in such a manner, I merely wish to remind him, that a scheme is not necessarily unjust because it inter-

feres in some degree with private patrons. To which it may be added, that the patrons of small livings will have the value of their patronage increased by the plan now proposed: and, since the small livings are more numerous than the large ones, the Church will, in fact, give back a larger sum to the lay patrons than what she takes from them. The livings which are taxed will continue to fetch the same price in the market; while the value of those which are augmented will be greatly increased.

But the real answer to this argument is, that Lord Henley does not understand the nature and extent of the scheme, or has not considered it in detail. Thus, after speaking of the benefit derived by the country from the incomes of a resident Clergy, he adds, “ And any scheme tending to diminish such an income by a ninth, or a tenth, would, in no inconsiderable degree, diminish that influence both upon the temporal and spiritual interests of a numerous population, which it is highly desirable should be possessed by its minister.” I perfectly agree with Lord Henley in this sentiment: but the force of it applies only to those persons who wish to take a ninth or a tenth from such incomes: and perhaps the simplest way to remove all misconception is to give at once a graduated scale, according to which I would propose that parochial benefices should be taxed.

A living of £200 <i>per annum</i> should pay	£1	0	0
250	1	5	0
300	1	15	0
350	2	10	0
400	3	10	0
450	4	15	0
500	6	5	0
550	8	0	0
600	10	0	0
650	12	5	0
700	14	15	0
750	17	10	0
800	20	10	0
850	23	15	0
900	27	5	0
950	31	0	0
1000	35	0	0
1050	39	5	0
1100	43	15	0
1150	48	10	0
1200	53	10	0
1250	58	15	0
1300	64	5	0
1350	70	0	0
1400	76	0	0
1450	82	5	0
1500	88	15	0
1550	95	10	0
1600	102	10	0
1650	109	15	0

A living of £1700 <i>per annum</i> should pay	£117	5	0
1750	125	0	0
1800	133	0	0
1850	141	5	0
1900	149	15	0
1950	158	10	0
2000	167	10	0

It will perhaps be suggested, that the scale ought not to have begun with livings of so low a value as 200*l.* and that all livings under 300*l. per annum* should be exempt from payment. I have no objection to such an arrangement: but there appeared to be more than one reason for beginning with livings of 200*l.* In the first place, the sum of 1*l.* or 1*l.* 5*s.* would hardly be felt. In the second place, I found, upon investigating a certain number of livings in a poor diocese, that the present payment of tenths is exactly on this average, i. e. that every 100*l.* of annual value pays 10*s.* Thirdly, if the plan proposed for augmenting small livings should be carried into effect, there will soon be no living of so low a value as 200*l. per annum*, so that the question now before us will become of no importance: and in the mean time it does not appear unjust, that a living of 300*l.* should pay 1*l.* 15*s. per annum.* I should not, however, object to beginning the scale with livings of 300*l.* which might pay an annual tax of 2*l.*

The little hardship, which would be felt by a taxation of this kind, will be seen by the following

table. It contains a list of all the livings in one particular Deanery, in which the livings are generally small. The names of the livings are not mentioned: but the first column exhibits their present annual income. The second shews the sum which they now pay for tenths: and the third specifies the sum which it is proposed for them to pay.

Annual Income.	Present Tenths.	Proposed Payment.
£.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
140 discharged		
500	1 17 7½	. . 6 5 0
400	0 13 11	. . 3 10 0
280	1 0 6½	. . 1 5 0
690	2 12 0½	. . 12 5 0
180	0 14 11¾	. . — — —
400	0 19 0½	. . 3 10 0
160	1 2 0¼	. . — — —
590	2 3 0½	. . 8 0 0
150 discharged		
250	1 14 11¼	. . 1 5 0
230	0 18 3	. . 1 0 0
230	1 5 8½	. . 1 0 0
210 discharged	— — —	. . 1 0 0
300	0 19 1	. . 1 15 0
250 discharged	— — —	. . 1 5 0
150 discharged		
	16 1 2	42 0 0

The first remark, which I have to make upon this list, is, that the livings contained in it, pay at

present 16*l.* 1*s.* 2*d.* for tenths, whereas the proposed plan of taxation would raise a sum of 42*l.*, and this in a very poor deanery. But I should now wish any person to examine the list, and to see whether there is anything in it approaching to 'hardship,' or to 'gross injustice.' Five of the livings were discharged altogether from the payment of tenths. Three of them would still continue discharged: but two, which have been raised to the incomes of 210*l.* and 250*l.*, would pay respectively 1*l.* and 1*l.* 5*s.* Two livings, which now pay tenths, but which have not increased in value, would be discharged altogether. The largest living upon the list has an income of 690*l.* *per annum.* It is proposed that this living should pay 12*l.* 5*s.* annually, which would reduce the living to 677*l.* 15*s.*: and I merely wish to ask, whether the value of the advowson, or the next presentation, would be injured by this deduction?

I would also remark in this place, that if a proper scale of taxation could be agreed upon, I would propose that the payment of first-fruits should be abolished altogether. Lord Harrowby, as quoted by Lord Henley, at page 24, has stated, in forcible terms, the hardship of this tax. Few persons would, perhaps, defend the continuance of it: and those incumbents, who have hitherto been opposed to my scheme, may become more reconciled to it, when they not only see the smallness of the sum which is proposed to be paid, but when they find

themselves relieved from the burthen of first-fruits. I have calculated, in the case of my own living, that, according to the scale proposed at page 25, the next incumbent would have paid, at the end of four years, 32*l.* : and, at the end of the same period, if he had paid the first-fruits and yearly tenths, he would have paid 30*l.* 2*s.* 7*d.* : so that it would not have been till the fourth year of his incumbency, that he would have found any difference at all : and the whole difference in every succeeding year, would only amount to 5*l.* 16*s.* 11½*d.* This, it will be observed, is upon a living of nearly 600*l. per annum* : and I can hardly think, that the incumbent would complain, if his payment was double that sum.

The next list is constructed upon similar principles with the last, and contains all the livings of a deanery in a different part of England, in which there is a greater mixture of large and small livings.

Annual Income.	Present Tenths.	Proposed Payment.
£.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
300	1 3 0¼	. . 1 15 0
200 discharged	— — —	. . 1 0 0
600	0 19 4	. . 10 0 0
400	0 16 0	. . 3 10 0
500	0 17 4	. . 6 5 0
260	1 6 0	. . 1 5 0
200 discharged	— — —	. . 1 0 0
300 discharged	— — —	. . 1 15 0

Annual Income.	Present Tenths.	Proposed Payment.
£.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
80 discharged		
1000	2 17 7	. . 35 0 0
50 discharged		
200 discharged	— — —	. . 1 0 0
300	0 11 7 $\frac{3}{4}$. . 1 15 0
200 discharged	— — —	. . 1 0 0
1200	2 13 3 $\frac{1}{2}$. . 53 10 0
60 discharged		
250	1 6 11 $\frac{3}{4}$. . 1 5 0
140	2 15 11	. — — —
400	1 15 2	. . 3 10 0
180 discharged		
60 discharged		
300	0 14 5	. . 1 15 0
250 discharged	— — —	. . 1 5 0
800	2 2 0	. . 20 10 0
	19 18 8 $\frac{1}{4}$	147 0 0

One more list, from a deanery in another part of England, widely distant from the other two, in which the livings are larger, will be sufficient to shew, in detail, whether the plan, when carried into practice, would be onerous or unjust.

Annual Income.	Present Tenths.	Proposed Payment.
£.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
350	1 6 8	. . 2 10 0
275	1 3 2 $\frac{1}{4}$. . 1 5 0

Annual Income.	Present Tenths.	Proposed Payment.
£.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
475	1 8 9 $\frac{3}{4}$	4 15 0
1750	4 19 3 $\frac{3}{4}$	125 0 0
675	6 12 3	12 5 0
650	2 12 8	12 5 0
700	1 19 2 $\frac{1}{4}$	14 15 0
650	1 8 1 $\frac{3}{4}$	12 5 0
350	0 19 0	2 10 0
250	1 19 0 $\frac{1}{4}$	1 5 0
450	2 5 3	4 15 0
650	1 11 0 $\frac{1}{4}$	12 5 0
300 discharged	— — —	1 15 0
125 discharged		
	28 4 6 $\frac{1}{4}$	207 10 0

I should now wish to calculate, what would be the sum raised from the whole of England and Wales, if all livings were taxed upon this scale. I have an account of the annual value of 509 livings, situated in the dioceses of Winchester, Hereford, Peterborough, Oxford, and Lichfield. The result may be seen by the following table :

Livings under 200 <i>l. per annum</i>	224
———— from 200 <i>l. to 300l.</i>	109
————— 300 <i>l. to 500l.</i>	111
———— above 500 <i>l.</i>	65
	509

The number of all the livings in England and Wales is estimated at ten thousand : and if we sup-

pose their incomes to be in the same proportion as those of the 509 livings mentioned above, the result will be as follows.

Livings under 200 <i>l. per annum</i>	4 01
———— from 200 <i>l.</i> to 300 <i>l.</i>	2, 00
————— 300 <i>l.</i> to 500 <i>l.</i>	2, 00
———— above 500 <i>l.</i>	1,277
	10,000

If we adopt the scale of taxation proposed in page 25, there will be 4,401 livings exempt from payment, as being under 200*l. per annum*. The livings from 200*l.* to 300*l.* and from 300*l.* to 500*l. per annum*, have been taken at a mean average as to payment: and with respect to the livings exceeding 500*l.*, I have taken them at an average of 800*l.* The whole sum to be raised by this mode of taxation would be as follows :

Livings from 200 <i>l.</i> to 300 <i>l. per ann.</i> to pay	£2,409
———— 300 <i>l.</i> to 500 <i>l.</i>	6,812
———— above 500 <i>l.</i>	26,178
	£35,399

It appears, therefore, that upon this very moderate scale of taxation, a sum of 35,399*l.* might be raised from the parochial benefices. I am aware, that many persons have proposed a higher scale, and I think my own decidedly too low. Thus the 1,277 livings, which exceed 500*l. per annum*, might pay much more than an average of 20*l.* 10*s.* each: but my object was to shew, that a large sum might

be raised without even an approximation to hardship or injustice : and whoever objects to my scale of taxation, as not taking enough from the larger benefices, is in fact strengthening my argument. It is to be mentioned also in recommendation of this scheme, that the sum raised by a taxation of benefices will be a constantly increasing sum. The livings now under 200*l.* will gradually be raised so as to pay their small assessment ; and other livings from various causes will be constantly increasing in value, and will be placed accordingly higher in the scale of taxation.

The next point for our calculation is the sum which would be raised by a taxation of Cathedral property : and here I venture to hope, that even Lord Henley would not complain of hardship or injustice. He assumes it as a settled point, that all this property may be subjected to any arrangements and modifications for the benefit of the Church : and if he has no scruple in taking the whole income of stalls for the augmentation of small livings, he cannot object to each stall being taxed for the same purpose. The difficulty which I feel is in fixing the scale, according to which the taxation shall be made. My object, however, is merely to shew, that a large sum may be raised in this way. I shall therefore make my calculations upon a scale which is lower than that which would probably be adopted : and if other persons would fix it higher, my argument, as before, is strengthened by a larger

sum being produced. It seems fair that a stall, which is worth 1000*l. per annum*, should be taxed at a higher rate than one which is only worth 500*l.*, and so on in proportion. I have followed this principle in the calculation for parochial benefices : but in the present instance I have considered cathedral preferment, which is under 500*l. per annum*, to be taxed at 5 per cent. : preferment between 500*l.* and 1000*l. per annum* to be taxed at 10 per cent. : and all higher preferment, at 20 per cent. There are deaneries and stalls which ought to pay more than 20 per cent. : but I am anxious, as before, to make a calculation, which may be considerably increased : and if we confine ourselves to the twenty-six Episcopal Chapters, and the two churches of Westminster and Windsor, it will be found that this moderate tax upon the incomes divided by the Deans and Prebendaries, would amount to the sum of 23,955*l. per annum*. If we add this to the sum of 35,399*l.*, which would arise from the taxation of livings, we shall have an aggregate of 59,354*l. per annum* for the augmentation of the small benefices.

Nor is this the only use which I would make of Cathedral property. It may perhaps be convenient to divide this species of property into three parts. One part is shared among the Deans and Canons, another among the vicars choral or chaplains, singing-men, choristers, &c. &c. ; in short, among those persons who perform that part of Divine Service, which does not fall upon the dignitaries : and

in some Cathedrals there is still a third portion, which is divided among persons, generally called Prebendaries, who have stalls in the Cathedral, but not seats in the Chapter, and whose incomes are extremely small. Of these three portions of Cathedral property, I would retain the two former on their present footing. The first would be taxed according to a graduated scale: the second is not at all too high in consideration of the services performed, and ought perhaps to be increased rather than diminished. But the third portion, which includes the minor stalls, might be devoted at once to the augmentation of small livings. I do not mean, according to Lord Henley's plan, that so much property should be taken out of the hands of the Chapters, and that the income of it should be paid to the small livings by a board of Commissioners. I would retain this species of preferment exactly on its present footing, as far as concerns its connexion with Cathedrals: but it should be given in every instance to the incumbents of small livings within the diocese. The addition of actual income in these cases would often be small: but the preferment, such as it is, would be properly bestowed: and without attributing feelings of worldly pride to the parochial minister, he would be pleased with his little accession of dignity, and his love for the village church would not be lessened by its being brought into closer proximity to the stately Cathedral.

There are also other collegiate bodies, besides those which we have now been considering, such as the Churches of Southwell, Ripon, Wolverhampton, &c. There would perhaps be no objection to devoting the whole of the property belonging to these bodies to the augmentation of small livings. In some cases they have livings in their own patronage: these might be immediately augmented by a different division of the income: and where they have no such patronage, the income might be given to the smallest livings in the neighbourhood of the places in which the property is situated. Lord Henley will perhaps find, that this would be a more effectual way of abolishing sinecures, than by putting Wolverhampton, Southwell, and Ripon, as he has proposed, upon a level with other Cathedrals, and calling the Deans into residence.

Having thus given my own arguments in support of a plan of taxation, I have pleasure in quoting the Quarterly Review as not unfavourable to it: though with an ingenuity common to his tribe, the writer contrives to disparage the plan as advanced by myself, and then to bring it forward as an invention of his own. After mentioning the scheme for “paying over the actual instead of the nominal first-fruits or tenths, or both, to Queen Anne’s Bounty, and so to make that fund effectual to the more rapid improvement of the poorest livings,” he goes on to say,* “Of this class of Reformers is the Regius Professor

* Number XCIV. p. 391.

of Divinity at Oxford." Upon which I have to observe, that if "this class of Reformers" means those persons who would enforce a payment of actual tenths, I have distinctly disclaimed belonging to such a class. The Reviewer then adds, "That such a plan presents difficulties, there can be no doubt: still it deserves consideration, whether, if not the scheme itself, some modification of it might not be adopted:" and this is precisely what I have said in the pamphlet referred to by the Reviewer.

He then proceeds to notice objections, in which he says that there is "much reason:" and if these can be answered satisfactorily, I venture to hope that he will lend his powerful support to the plan of taxation. "Two-thirds of the livings in England and Wales are in the gift of laymen—they, no doubt, would be often found unwilling to relinquish a portion of property at the disposal of them and of their heirs for ever. Some persons have bought advowsons, and it may be said to be hard upon them to load them with a payment which was not considered in the purchase money." I have already observed, that this objection is founded upon the notion of a *large* sum being taken from every living: whereas the tables in page 25 will shew that this is by no means intended. Very few patrons, if any, will be required "to relinquish a portion of their property:" and the expression of "loading them with a payment" is altogether inapplicable to the small sum which it is proposed to take from them.

The Reviewer then says, "There are those who have an objection, and a fair objection, to the principle, which certainly is of a levelling tendency, and might be urged further than was intended." I am utterly at a loss to know how this can be considered by the Reviewer a fair objection, except indeed as to the latter part, that the scheme "might be urged further than was intended." This is undoubtedly true: and when the Reviewer will produce any scheme of Reform, which is not *liable* to be carried too far, I will attempt to remove his fears in the present instance: but with respect to the "levelling," or, as he afterwards calls it, "equalizing tendency" of the principle of taxation, the tendency appears to me to be exactly the contrary. The Reviewer would seem to have forgotten, that a most levelling principle of taxation has existed ever since the time of Henry the Eighth. All livings were then charged with a payment of actual tenths: and though it is true that the tenths are not paid according to their present value, still "the principle," as it is termed by the Reviewer, is strictly "levelling." On the other hand, the scheme which is now proposed, so far from being of "a levelling tendency," pays a due regard to the different proportions of income. Livings of the same "level" as to annual value, are put upon the same "level" as to taxation: but livings of a higher "level" as to income, are to be put upon a higher "level" as to taxation: so that the Reviewer would

have been more correct in saying, that the payment of tenths had been conducted on a levelling principle ever since the Reformation; but that now a scheme was proposed, which would make the payments vary in proportion to the income.

The next objection is still more inexplicable. "Some may argue, and justly argue, that the Church Establishment is for the general benefit of the public, not for the exclusive benefit of the individual minister; and therefore that the public ought to take their share in the sacrifice thus demanded for the public service." This is the very argument which I would use in favour of my scheme of taxation. The Church Establishment is undoubtedly for the general benefit of the public: and when the Reviewer observes, that "the public ought to take their share in the sacrifice thus demanded for the public service," I should have expected him to draw the conclusion, that patrons of livings ought "to take their share in the sacrifice thus demanded for the public service;" especially when the sacrifice is proved to be so extremely small. His inference, however, seems to be exactly the contrary: and there is probably some link in his reasoning which I do not comprehend.

Lastly, he says, "Some again may contend, that though there are many livings so small as to call loudly for augmentation, there are very few livings so large as to bear a reduction for such a

purpose." Instead of there being very few livings which would bear the small reduction, which it is proposed to make in them, there are really very few which would feel it at all. The next incumbent of a living which is now worth 1000*l. per annum*, will not complain very much at receiving only 965*l.* : and I have already observed, that the sale of the advowson would scarcely, if at all, be affected.

I have now gone through all the objections noticed by the Reviewer, and I cannot help imagining that they did not appear to himself to carry much weight. He afterwards says, " We observe, indeed, that Dr. Burton confines his proposition to the tenths, and we think he is right ;—whether some portion, as we have already hinted, less than a tenth might not suffice, or whether some graduated scale might not be adopted in reference to the value of the benefice, it being obvious that a living of a thousand a year could afford to pay a hundred pounds better than one of half the sum to pay fifty ; but these are all matters which this is not the season for discussing."* I wish the reader to compare this sentence with the following passage from my pamphlet, which the Reviewer appears to have had before his eyes, and almost to have copied in the very words. " There is, per-

* This sentence is copied accurately, even to the punctuation. There seems to be some grammatical defect, though the meaning is obvious.

haps, no virtue or charm in the number ten. A graduated scale might be agreed upon; and every living above a certain value, as well as preferment in cathedrals, might be taxed according to its income. It is obvious that an incumbent of a thousand pounds a year could much better afford to pay a ninth, than an incumbent of three hundred pounds a year could pay a tenth." The reader will, perhaps, think that the words "as we have hinted," might as well have been changed into "as we have borrowed the hint;" but I am perfectly satisfied with having the concurrence of this able writer, and shall be happy to take from him any hints which he may be able to give upon a subject in which we both feel a common interest.

It will perhaps be asked, Whether this is all the Reform which I would propose? and whether I would suffer all the abuses to remain, which are now found in our Cathedrals and parochial benefices? If I knew how to shape my answer, so as to meet the wishes of the most ardent Reformer, or if I could borrow from Lord Henley his most earnest protestations against clerical abuses, I might perhaps hope to make myself understood on this important subject. Lord Henley says, in one sentence, "The most prominent evil in the Church is the non-residence of the beneficed Clergy and the system of pluralities." To this I heartily subscribe, and most thankful should I feel, if I could join his Lordship in any scheme for prevent-

ing these crying evils. But if I am not mistaken, I mentioned in my former pamphlet the real impediment to their removal. In nineteen cases out of twenty the fault is in the patron. The Church is not the cause of non-residence or pluralities, except where the patronage belongs to an ecclesiastical body: and I have no wish to say, that Bishops or Chapters are less liable to err in this matter than laymen. I would only observe, that lay-patrons are vastly more numerous, and much more jealous of any interference with their patronage.

I would extend this remark to almost every topic which is touched upon by Lord Henley. He inveighs most justly against the translation of Bishops: and I have literally not found a Clergyman who does not take the same view. Why then is this evil inflicted upon the Church? According to Lord Henley it may be explained on the following principle. "If any one turns to the list of the Dignitaries of our Cathedrals, he will find that not more than one-twentieth of them have had any claims to preferment, on the ground of theological or even of literary attainments. Parliamentary Interest, Family Connections, or Party Gratitude, have in general filled up all vacancies as they have arisen, with the Sons, the Brothers, and the Tutors of Ministers, and of their adherents." It will be remembered that these are the words of Lord Henley: and if the fact be so, it would be

more reasonable in him to write upon State Reform than upon Church Reform. It now appears, that the Church is the suffering and not the offending party. She has all these evils inflicted upon her by ambitious or irreligious statesmen; and yet she is abused, as if she were herself the cause of all the evil. Lord Henley mentions the case of the Earl of Bridgewater, who “drew the magnificent income of one of the golden stalls of Durham while living at Paris.” I merely ask, who gave him a dispensation from residing at Durham?—The Crown. In the same way we might go through almost every case of abuse, which is mentioned by Lord Henley and other Church Reformers. I have no wish to say, that the Church is free from blame. In a body of fifteen thousand persons, there must be many, I fear, who are forgetful of their clerical character, and traitors to the Master whom they pretend to serve. Most earnestly do I wish, that the Government and the Legislature would make it more and more difficult for a Clergyman to neglect his duty. *At quis custodiet ipsos Custodes?* The Government may at this moment, without any Act of Parliament, prevent nearly all the abuses, which are mentioned by Lord Henley. And yet these abuses exist. Surely, then, Church Reform means more than is generally intended by that expression.

In the first place, it is absolutely necessary that the patronage of ecclesiastical preferment should

be taken from the Crown, or at least submitted to some control. I shall speak out upon this subject more plainly than Lord Henley. He says, as I have quoted him at page 19, that "the time is not yet arrived, when we can hope for any legislative enactment respecting the mode of disposing of the Crown Patronage." I say, in answer to this, that if the time is not yet arrived, we may spare ourselves the trouble of discussing Church Reform. If "the influence of politics" is to be prevented, which Lord Henley justly describes as "that fertile source of jobbing, ambition, secularity, and scandal," ecclesiastical patronage must not be left in the hands of mere politicians. It is more difficult to point out a plan by which this patronage shall be administered: nor do I feel called upon to hazard the arrangement of all these details. A writer, quoted and approved by Lord Henley, has proposed "to vest the Crown Patronage in ten unpaid Commissioners, members of the Church of England, and chosen for their known devotion to it." Commissioners of this kind might, perhaps, be trusted. The Archbishop of the Province, the Bishop and Archdeacons of the Diocese, together with an equal number of laymen, (the latter to be changed every year,) might very well dispose of all the Cathedral and parochial preferment which was in that Diocese and belonging to the Crown. The preferment in the gift of the Bishop and the Chapter, and per-

haps of all corporate bodies, might also be put upon the same footing. I should like to say something as to livings in private patronage. But I am aware that this is tender ground: and I must, perhaps, be satisfied with hoping, that when all other livings are given to deserving persons, private patrons will not suffer their own sons or relations to form the only exception.

Having thus provided against Cathedral preferment being given to unworthy persons, or as a political job, we may hope, with Lord Henley, that it will be given as a reward to merit of some kind or other, or at least with a regard to spiritual and professional qualifications. With respect to the Cathedral establishments, there is no difference between Lord Henley and myself as to the expediency of retaining the daily choral service. We should, perhaps, agree also as to the want of some more effective and uniform regulations for the residence of those persons who are to attend this daily service. Lord Henley would entrust the performance of it exclusively to the Dean and two Chaplains. I cannot assent to this part of the plan. That the Deaneries may be considered "as the reward or the support of those learned men, whom it may be found more proper to advance in this mode, than by either episcopal or parochial preferment," may be a good suggestion, as a general principle; but I cannot agree with

Lord Henley, when he would prohibit all Deans from having parochial preferment. I would not reward a learned theologian with giving him the care of a large parish : but if the Incumbent of a living was deserving of a Deanery for his professional learning, I would not oblige him to resign his living upon becoming a Dean. Lord Henley himself speaks of “ the coldness and formality of Cathedral service : ” and he would lead me to a totally opposite conclusion from his own, when he says, in another place, of the Dignitaries in Cathedrals, “ They are connected with no poor, who look up to them as their protectors and guides ; they have no sick and dying to pray with ; no children to catechize ; no flock towards whom the sympathies and affections of a Pastor can be called forth. The most important offering to God’s glory and service is a formal attendance on a cold and pompous ceremonial.” Now, instead of consigning the Dean for his whole life to this most uninteresting routine of daily ministrations, I should think that I was doing a great deal of good both to his body and his soul, by allowing him to pass some months of the year in residing at his living. The care of the parish would be entrusted for the remainder of the year to a resident Curate : and if it be said, that the Curate, who does all the work, ought to receive all the income, I answer, in the first place, that

the Dean, according to the plan here proposed, would be an occasional labourer in the vineyard, and would be entitled to part of the hire.

But there is another answer to this remark, which is too apt to be forgotten, or is, perhaps, not even thought of, by many who discuss the question of residence. It is absolutely necessary for the well-being of the Church, that there should always be a large number of Curates actively employed. Whatever steps are taken for forcing Incumbents to reside, care must be taken that the race of Curates is not extinguished: and if Lord Henley will reconsider his plan with this remark before him, he will, perhaps, see that the tendency of all his regulations is to make the services of a Curate wholly unnecessary. An abolition of pluralities, and a general residence of Incumbents, will undoubtedly cause a diminution in the number of Curates. In some respects this may be found to be an inconvenience: but the evil of pluralities is so flagrant, and the duty of residence is so unquestionable, that we must not hesitate in prohibiting the one and enforcing the other: but if there was no other argument for retaining the stalls in Cathedrals, and for allowing the possessors of them to hold livings, I would rest the defence of both these measures upon the certainty which they cause of providing employment for Curates. If all the Dignitaries, mentioned at page 15, were also Incumbents of livings, they would find em-

ployment for nearly two hundred and thirty Curates : and whoever thinks that a Clergyman should learn his profession before he is entrusted with a parish, will feel that these remarks are not without their weight.

Whatever has been said concerning Deans, will apply with equal force to Canons and Prebendaries. There appears to me a great advantage in having other persons, beside the Dean, to take part in the Cathedral service. I have already proposed that regulations should be made as to the residence of Prebendaries : and if the measure approved by Lord Henley for the proper appointment of these persons should be enforced, we may hope that his object may be accomplished of making the service of the Cathedral “ become more parochial, and therefore more devotional and spiritual in its nature.” Lord Henley would allow a Prebendary to hold no living, except one which is situated in the cathedral town. I would extend the permission, as in the case of Deans, to a living, not only in the same Diocese, but in any part of England : but it must be remembered, that the plan suggested for the appointment of Prebendaries will make it very unlikely that they should have any living, except in the Diocese where the Cathedral is situated. It will perhaps be thought that I am not competent to give an opinion upon the subject ; since the stall, which is attached to my Professorship in the University, has

also a living annexed to it by Act of Parliament. My remarks will, therefore, be treated as those of an interested witness : but, at the same time, they proceed from one who has experience upon the subject : and I do most earnestly entreat Lord Henley not to reduce Deans and Canons to the useless character of monks in a cloister ; and not to take from them that excitement to evangelical holiness, which the active discharge of parochial ministry is alone calculated to supply. Lord Henley is not aware of the relief which is felt at seeing a village church and a village school after residence in a cathedral town. Let me assure him, that the service of a Cathedral does not unfit a man for the parochial ministry : or, if it has this tendency, we cannot confer upon him a greater benefit, than by making the one duty alternate with the other : and if the mind of the Clergyman will thus be more directed to spiritual pursuits, his parish is also likely to be benefited, which for several months in the year receives the attention of the Incumbent as well as of the Curate. Nor is this all. A much larger sum will be spent in parochial charities by the system here recommended, than if the Prebendary spends the whole of his income in the cathedral town, and if the living, which he might otherwise have held, is to maintain a separate Incumbent. The reason why the union of a living and a stall is so often reprobated is, that a residence of one or two

months at the Cathedral is taken as an exemption from all residence on a living. But this crying abuse should be prohibited. A Prebendary might be bound to shorter residence on his living than other Incumbents: but a certain number of months should be specified, (perhaps five would be thought sufficient:) and if he did not comply with this, his living should be forfeited. I feel convinced, that a regulation of this kind would prove of great service both to the Incumbent and the parish. The parsonage house on many a small living would be improved: the poor would feel the benefit of a longer purse than that of an ordinary Incumbent: and cathedral property would thus, by the best of all arrangements, contribute to the augmentation of smaller benefices.

While we are thus making regulations for preferment in Cathedrals, we ought to take into consideration the case of Archdeacons. It is grievous to think of the miserable provision which is made in almost every Diocese for these persons, whose services are so valuable and so laborious. One very obvious mode of paying them presents itself by annexing a stall in the Cathedral to each Archdeaconry. It is true, that the Bishop would thus virtually have the presentation to as many stalls as he has Archdeacons in his Diocese: but I cannot think that this patronage would be looked upon with suspicion.

Appointments to responsible stations are generally made properly : and it would be easy, if it should be thought necessary, to guard against abuse in this instance. I am at present only concerned in recommending, that all Archdeacons should have Prebends in the Cathedral. It would also be desirable, that they should have a parochial benefice : and then attendance at the Cathedral, as well as their absence upon visitations, would almost always require them to keep a Curate ; the advantage of which measure to the Church at large has already been pointed out. When this sufficient maintenance was provided for the Archdeacons, they might give up the payments which they now receive from parochial Incumbents. The sums which are collected for the Archdeacon, under the name of Procurations and Synodals, give rise to troublesome, if not vexatious transactions. I would propose, that they should be entirely given up : and the remission of this payment will, in many cases, reduce the taxation proposed at page 25, to a still smaller sum.

I am not afraid of being looked upon as a defender of pluralities, because I have made an exception in favour of Deans and Prebendaries. If a law should be strictly and literally enforced, that no spiritual person should hold two pieces of preferment of any kind together, the race of Curates, as I have already observed, would almost become

extinct. A title for orders would be extremely difficult to be obtained: and some other facilities must be given for admission into the Church. I have also endeavoured to shew, that the income derived from Cathedrals is likely to be more beneficially expended, where a living and a stall are held by the same person: and my own opinion would lead me to extend the same privilege to Heads of Colleges in the Universities, and to Professors *who are resident there*. In settling this question, we must not allow ourselves to be led away by the dread of the word *plurality*. Much evil has undoubtedly come upon the Church, and is still felt by it, from the numerous cases of pluralities: but while we are trying to remove these evils, we must remember that the permanent good of the Church, and not the application of a theory, is the object which we should keep in view. The persons whom I have now mentioned, are never bound to reside more than five or six months in the year at the University. If they had a living, they might be able to reside upon it for a certain number of months, which should be prescribed by law.* Even the name of *pluralists* would not strictly be applicable to them; for the Headship of a College is not a benefice. They would be hindered from turning

* I was myself resident for twenty-eight weeks on my living in the course of last year: and I have already (September) resided twenty weeks in the present year, though I am necessarily resident in Oxford every term.

their living into a sinecure : and the income of it would almost always be expended in the parish.

Having made these exceptions, I would join Lord Henley, or the most rigid Reformer, in strictly prohibiting all other pluralities. Sinecures of every kind should be immediately abolished. No person should hold preferment, even of the smallest value, in two Cathedrals. No two benefices, of any kind, where there is cure of souls, should be held together under any circumstances. A full residence of nine months, except in the cases lately mentioned, should be required of every incumbent. The Bishops should have more power than is now entrusted to them, of correcting abuses : and if patrons of livings could be restrained, by any means, from bestowing them upon unworthy persons, I should not despair, when all these regulations were in action, of witnessing the blessings of Church Reform in the faith and practice of all Christians.

I would willingly follow Lord Henley in not considering the subject of tithes to belong properly to the question now before us : but there is a passage in his pamphlet, which deserves much consideration, and which strongly confirms the remark which I ventured to make upon tithes in my former publication. It was there laid down as a fundamental principle, that “ tithes must be paid to somebody.” We have heard much of late concerning the extinction of tithes : and persons have talked, even

in the House of Commons, as if the tenth portion of the produce of the earth was itself to be extinguished. It is hopeless to reason with such persons: and the question appears capable of being summed up in a very few words. The tithes will either remain the property of the Church, or they will not. If they do not, they will either be taken by the Government, or will come into the hands of private individuals: but in either case, the tenth portion of the produce will have a value set upon it, and that value must be paid. When the experiment has been tried, it will be seen whether the farmer paid more to the Clergyman than he will to the Government, or the Squire. On the other hand, if tithes remain the property of the Church, either the present system will be continued, which allows the collection of tithes or a composition, or else there will be a general commutation. In the latter case, the clergy and the farmers will be relieved from many unpleasant collisions; but whoever says, that a commutation of tithe will be a pecuniary gain to the farmer, is either lamentably ignorant, or is courting popularity by supporting a delusion.

Lord Henley is evidently aware, that the Clergy make less by their property than other persons, and writes as follows. “ It must be further observed in recommendation of the plan, that the revenues of the Church would be materially augmented by it. The estates, as is well known, are principally let

upon leases for lives or for years, renewable on the payment of fines. The lessors are at best only tenants for life, and often considerably advanced in years; and, in many of the less lucrative stations, their tenure is of a still more transitory nature, as it combines both the chances of life and the chances of promotion. The consequence has been, that the Church, in many cases, receives much less for renewals, than what, upon a fair calculation, she is entitled to. This will be remedied by the appointment of a Board of a fixed and permanent nature. Not that the leases of Church property can, with justice, be suffered to run out, though its income would thereby be immensely increased. For as the practice of renewal, within certain limits, has obtained for so great a length of time; as so much property has been bought and sold, and so many family arrangements, by wills or settlement, made upon the faith of it; the most ardent friend of the Church could scarcely require an end to be put to this species of property. But it would be easy to arrange such an equitable scale, upon sound principles, as would greatly improve the patrimony of the Church, without effecting any injustice to those who have for centuries been its tenants." I am glad that this was written by a layman, rather than by a Clergyman. The fact is here plainly avowed, that persons, who hold land or tithes under the Church, would have to pay more, if the Church ceased to be the proprietor. Lord Henley, it is

true, has pointed out the injustice of this alteration : but, at the same time, he undoubtedly recommends, that, to a certain degree, it should be effected. The increased value of Church property, which would follow, is urged as an argument in recommendation of his own plan : and when we read, that such an improvement could not take place, unless the estates were managed by a Board, the real meaning is, that the improvement will take place, when the estates are managed by a Board. This then will be one of the effects of Church Reform, as proposed by Lord Henley. The Church is now perfectly contented to receive less than what she knows to be her due, nor has she any intention of exacting a larger sum : but when the Church is reformed on Lord Henley's plan, the persons who now hold under the Church, will have, in some shape or other, to make larger payments. The plan which I have proposed, will not subject these persons to such a burthen. Abuses will be removed, but the frame-work and machinery of the Church Establishment will remain unchanged : and the result will be, that a large sum will be applied to the augmentation of small livings, though the sources from which the sum is drawn, will not be increased.

I would also mention, with respect to a commutation of tithe, that the plan which I have proposed, is wholly unconnected with the question. A sum is to be raised for the augmentation of small livings

from the annual incomes of the beneficed Clergy : but whether these incomes are derived from tithes, or from a sum of money paid in commutation of tithe, makes no difference whatever. There is, however, one point, which I have not seen noticed in any plan of Church Reform, but which appears to me deserving of consideration. It will be said, perhaps, that this or any plan for augmenting benefices will in fact be the means of making a great and permanent increase to the property of the Church. It will undoubtedly have that effect: but so far from it being desirable to prevent such an increase, it might be easily shewn that the country is interested in allowing it. Lord Henley and all persons who really consider Church Reform to be a religious question, will agree with me in wishing, that every living in England was able to maintain a resident incumbent: by which I mean, that the incumbent of every living, though he has no other source of income, should be able to support a family and to contribute to parochial charities. It has been calculated, and Lord Henley appears inclined to admit the calculation, that “if all the revenues of the parochial clergy were equally divided amongst them, there would not be more than 185*l.* *per annum* for each.” The whole income of the parochial clergy might therefore be increased three or four fold, before the most economical calculator would think that each incumbent was overpaid : and this is the first answer to be made to the remark,

that a fund for augmenting small livings will make a permanent increase to the property of the Church. It is of vital importance to the interests of religion, that the incomes of the parochial clergy should be thus increased.

But even at the distant period, when the 10,000 livings in England shall be raised to the income of 600*l.* each, there will still be ample employment for the sum which is applied to their augmentation. By that time the population of England and Wales will be greatly increased: and even now there are hundreds, if not thousands, of livings, which are much too large for the labours of one minister. As the population increases, parishes may be divided and subdivided almost without end; and incomes will be wanted for the ministers of these newly created parishes. At present there are 4,809 livings, upon which a Clergyman cannot reside for want of a sufficient parsonage house. These houses ought to be built: and it is impossible to contemplate the time, when new churches might not be erected with advantage: all which may perhaps diminish the fears of those persons, who think that the property of the Church ought not to receive a permanent increase. There never will be a want of objects, upon which the surplus funds of the Church may be expended: and though I have no wish to enter into a question of political economy, I should be fully prepared to prove, that if a sum is saved from the annual incomes of some of the Clergy, which permanently increases

the incomes of other Clergymen, the country is benefited by the creation of so much capital.

There is one more point, which Lord Henley has introduced into his plan, which I would rather leave to the discussion of other persons. I allude to his observations upon the Bishops. With respect to their incomes, I have already stated, that Lord Henley would distribute among them exactly the same sum which is distributed now ; so that in a financial point of view the country has no interest in this part of the question : but it must be remembered, that this same sum is now found sufficient for the repair of the Bishops' residences, and for the expenses of their visitations : whereas Lord Henley's equalizing scheme would require both these charges to be defrayed out of another fund. The other reforms, which Lord Henley would recommend with respect to the Bishops, relate to translations, commendams, and their seats in the House of Lords. With regard to the two first, I am convinced that his Lordship is speaking the sentiments of the great body of the Clergy, when he wishes to have them prohibited : but again I ask, why do they exist ? Lord Henley states the reason to be, because " the appointment to the highest offices in the Church is in the nomination of the Prime Minister, who is oppressed on every vacancy with the importunate demands of the powerful and influential, urging upon him the claims of kinsmen and dependants." I give no opinion as to the truth of this remark ; but if things be

indeed so, I call upon the public to decide, whether Reform is not wanted for the laity as well as for the Clergy.

With respect to the question of Bishops sitting in the House of Lords, I have no intention of entering into it, except that in the name of all sound and legitimate interpretation, I must protest against the New Testament being quoted to prove, that our Saviour and his Apostles discountenance the idea of Bishops taking part in the counsels of the nation. It is with utter astonishment, that I find Lord Henley urging our Saviour's declaration, that *his kingdom is not of this world*. This text, and the others quoted by his Lordship, prove that Christ did not claim, as Head of the Church, to have temporal dominion, nor to give judgment in civil and criminal cases: and they equally shew, that the Apostles and their successors cannot claim such a right in virtue of any office which they hold in Christ's spiritual kingdom: but who ever said, that the Archbishop of Canterbury had a temporal kingdom, or that he has a right, *as Archbishop*, to give judgment in civil and criminal cases? When the Bishop of Rome laid claim to the sovereignty of the world, and set himself above emperors and kings, then indeed it was a most legitimate argument to quote to him the words of our Saviour, *My kingdom is not of this world*. So also if the Scotch Bishops, or the Bishop of Sodor and Man, should go to the door of the House of Lords and say, We claim to be admitted,

as being Bishops over Christ's flock,—this text would be as effectual in keeping them out, as the wand of the serjeant at arms. But this text has nothing whatever to do with the ministers of Christ exercising civil power, when the civil government of the country thinks proper to invest them with it.

When Lord Henley was referring to texts of Scripture, he might have noticed 1 Cor. vi. 1—6. where St. Paul advises Christians to decide causes among themselves, without going before the heathen: and no person can imagine that he meant to prohibit the presbyters or deacons of the Corinthian Church from taking part in such matters. Their spiritual office did not give them the right of deciding, but it did not take from them the rights, whatever they might be, which they shared in common with other Christians. In a word, the text in John xviii. 36. is conclusive against priests usurping civil power *as priests*; but it is wholly silent as to the duties which they are to fulfil as citizens. It is for the legislature to decide, whether the Clergy may hold certain offices: and the Church is to decide, whether it is expedient for religion that they should hold them: but the New Testament gives no precepts upon the subject, except that it enjoins all men to obey the legislature, and that it holds up religion as the one thing needful. The fallacy in Lord Henley's reasoning is a very common one. It turns upon an equivocal use of the word *Church*, which is often taken to mean the Clergy, whereas it properly in-

cludes all Christians. So *the kingdom of Christ* has the same extensive meaning, and can never be taken to mean only the Bishops. Though the Clergy are *overseers*, or *ministers*, or *stewards*, or *ambassadors* in this spiritual kingdom, yet all Christians are members of it: and if Bishops are excluded from all civil jurisdiction, because Christ is their king, all Christians are equally excluded. Will Lord Henley say, that a Christian lawyer is less a member of Christ's kingdom than a Christian Bishop? They are both subjects of *a kingdom which is not of this world*: and the relation in which they both stand to Christ has nothing to do with the relation in which they stand to the civil community. If Christ had said, (as Lord Henley would interpret his words,) that the ministers of his religion should not hold certain offices in the state, he would have been doing the very thing which Lord Henley denies him to have done: he would have been interfering directly in civil matters; so that instead of quoting this text against the propriety of Bishops sitting in the House of Lords, I should quote it as a positive proof that Christ meant to give no rules concerning such matters.

If the legislature should decide, that the Bishops are not to retain their seats in the House of Lords, the Church, of course, will acquiesce in the decision: and if Lord Henley, or any person, will prove, that "the parliamentary peerage of the prelates is prejudicial to the cause of religion," I

would be the first to pray that the act of exclusion may be past. This, however, is not the place for discussing such a question. The example of the Apostles, “ who, content with such things as were provided for them, sought neither personal aggrandizement nor civil power,” can hardly be considered pertinent. The argument would be just as good against a Clergyman having a comfortable freehold house, and a certain income of 400*l* a-year, as against Bishops sitting in the House of Lords. If we take the Jewish Sanhedrim, or the Roman Senate, it was certainly not very likely, that the Apostles would have seats in either of them: but it would be difficult to suppose that this was made to them a matter of choice, or that they refused the dignity from a regard to their spiritual duties. St. Paul took good care to assert his rights as citizen of Rome, though he was serving a Master whose *kingdom is not of this world*: and so the Bishops may be extending the interests of that kingdom, while they are acting in the capacity of temporal legislators. If it should be proved, that this is not likely to be the result, no real Christian will be opposed to their exclusion: but the question must be decided by a reference to the interests of religion in the first place, and to the good of the country in the second.

I have now gone through all the material points in Lord Henley’s plan of Church Reform: and at the same time I have endeavoured to

explain my own views upon the subject. I have a satisfaction in repeating my conviction that our opinions are not greatly at variance. We are both agreed in saying, that the end of Church Reform is the spiritual improvement of the community, or, in other words, the extension of Christ's kingdom upon earth. We are agreed in thinking that the augmentation of small livings is of essential and primary importance toward the attainment of this object. Lord Henley has proposed a scheme, which he thinks would produce an annual sum of 150,000*l.* for the augmentation of small livings. I have shewn from his own statements, and from calculations upon a very moderate scale, that this sum would be so reduced as not to leave more than 26,315*l.* for that purpose: there is good reason to think that the surplus would be nothing at all. My own scheme would produce an annual sum of 59,354*l.* for the augmentation of small livings: and the calculations have been made on so low a scale, that this sum would, in fact, be much greater: in addition to which, I have recommended that all the minor stalls in Cathedrals, and the property of other collegiate Churches, should be applied to the same purpose. Lord Henley is strongly opposed to the plan of raising this sum by a taxation of benefices: but I have endeavoured to shew, that he has entirely misunderstood the plan, or not considered it in detail,

and that his arguments are, in fact, directed against a scheme which is essentially different. Lord Henley's plan would require the whole establishment of our Cathedrals, as it is at present, to be pulled down and re-modelled : and yet he would not raise as large a sum for the augmentation of livings, as the plan which I have proposed, which would leave every thing connected with our Cathedrals on its present footing, with the exception, that all abuses would be corrected, and that Cathedral preferment would be bestowed much more properly than it is at present.

Lord Henley has spoken even more strongly than myself, as to " the preservation of the perfect inviolability of all life interests : " so that the calculated sum would not be produced by either of these plans, until the present possessors of preferment had died off. But the nature of Lord Henley's plan would make it much longer in coming into full operation than mine. There are so many sums to be paid out of his nominal fund of 150,000*l.*, before any part of it would be applicable to small livings, that many years would elapse before this benefit would be obtained. Lord Henley has himself provided, in Section XVII.,—" That, in case the revenues and other funds be at first inadequate to the various payments fixed by the Act, the Corporation may borrow money upon Bills, in the nature of Exchequer Bills, bearing interest : " and the effect of this provision upon the surplus appli-

cable to small livings, is so extremely fatal, that I am almost ashamed of giving the calculation. In the first year of the existence of the Board, it would have to pay the Expenses of the Act, the Salaries of the Commissioners, Repairs of Cathedrals, Bishops' and Archdeacons' Visitation Expenses, Retiring Pensions, &c. &c. which, according to the calculation at page 14, would amount at least to 70,000*l.* : and, to meet all these payments, it would have the income of as much chapter preferment, as should happen to become vacant in the course of that year. I will suppose the season to be unhealthy, and that four Deans and twenty Canons die within the year; which is an extravagant calculation. There are now twenty-six Deans, (if we except St. David's, and Llandaff,) whose average income is 1,780*l.* each; there are also one hundred and seventy-seven Prebendaries, (if we except St. David's, Llandaff, St. Asaph, and Bangor,) whose average income is 847*l.* each. The incomes, therefore, of the four Deans and twenty Canons, if we take the largest average, would amount to 24,000*l.* The Board would then have to appoint four Deans and eight Chaplains, according to the new arrangement; whose stipends, according to Section XXX. would come to 6,932*l.* The twenty stalls, according to Section XXXI. would be annexed to livings in the cathedral towns, the average income of which is to be 1000*l.* each: thus, the twenty stalls, which before produced an aggregate income of 16,940*l.*,

would now be raised to 20,000*l. per annum* : so that the Board would have to pay to these Deans and Prebendaries the sum of 26,932*l.* : but the fund for making this payment would only amount to 24,000*l.*, beside its being charged with the above-mentioned payments of 70,000*l.* : so that in the first year the Board would have to borrow 72,932*l.* I will not trouble the reader with the details of calculations for the second year. Suffice it to say, that the whole expenditure (including four per cent. interest upon the debt,) would amount to 127,781*l.* : to meet which, if we suppose a similar mortality, the Board would have an income of 48,000*l.* : so that it would have to borrow an additional sum of 79,781*l.* Thus the debt would go on increasing in this alarming ratio, till all the ancient Chapters were cleared off; at which time it would be ascertained, whether the cathedral property really amounted to 300,000*l.* : but it is much more probable, that before that time arrived, the whole scheme would be given up in despair: and, at all events, I would undertake to prove, that fifty years would pass away, before a single shilling could be applied to the increase of small livings: whereas, according to my plan, the very first benefice of any kind, above the value of 200*l.*, which became vacant, would add something to the present fund of Queen Anne's Bounty. Even the present possessors of benefices, though they would not be compelled to any payment, might, perhaps, be induced to

submit voluntarily to the tax which would be laid upon their successors. Such contributions would not be expected from incumbents of moderate livings, with large families: but, I have little doubt, that if the example was once set, it would be followed, in many instances, cheerfully and liberally. When it was seen, that the Church was really in earnest, and that the Clergy were contributing so large a sum for the improvement of small livings, lay patrons would, perhaps, be induced to join in accelerating the work. The patrons of small livings would, in fact, receive very good interest for their money, if, by a donation, or a small annual subscription, they could bring their own livings within earlier reach of augmentation. I may mention also, that the management of Lord Henley's fund would require the machinery of a Corporation, the expense of which has been stated, upon a low estimate, at 5000*l. per annum*: whereas, the sum raised by taxation of benefices would still be managed by the Commissioners of Queen Anne's Bounty, and the salary of a few additional clerks would be the whole increase of expense.

I have already mentioned, that Lord Henley's plan, as well as my own, requires the Crown patronage to be vested in other hands: and both of us would need the passing of an Act of Parliament: but there is this essential difference between us, that unless the Crown will surrender its patronage of Cathedral preferment, Lord Henley's scheme

will fall entirely to the ground : but if an Act was passed for the taxation of benefices, my plan would come immediately into operation, though the Crown still continued to present to preferment. We both of us wish to see this preferment given to proper persons : but Lord Henley has made this an essential part of his scheme : if I may so express it, the religious and pecuniary parts of his plan must stand or fall together : whereas, I have provided against the contingent possibility of patrons not choosing to do their duty. I wish that they could be compelled to act properly : but if they persist in continuing abuses ; if Church Reform is still hindered, *as it has hitherto been*, by lay patrons, I have proposed a scheme, which will make even abuses contribute to the cause of religion. In a word, Lord Henley cannot prevent sinecures, though he points out the evil of them : but until I can prevent their existence, I would tax them heavily : and I cannot but think, that this practical view of the question gives a great advantage to my plan over that of his Lordship.

Lord Henley's plan, as I have already observed, would nearly extinguish Curates altogether. Their number will be lessened by any scheme for preventing pluralities and non-residence : but the one recommended in these pages, which allows a living to be held with a Deanery, or a Prebend, will always ensure a certain number of Curates.

These are some of the points of comparison, in which I venture to think, that the preference may

be given to a scheme of taxation. The public will decide, whether I have summed up with sufficient impartiality. The question of Church Reform must and will be agitated by many persons, who do not understand the first principles of it. They neither know the meaning of *the Church*, nor of *Reform*. If we put aside those persons, who do not believe the Gospel, who write for hire, and for any side which will pay them, who court popularity by popular delusions, and who wish to transfer the tithes from the Clergy to themselves,—I say, if we except these persons, the question of Church Reform has hitherto been discussed by very few writers. Lord Henley has set the example of treating it as a religious subject. I trust that he will be followed by others, who write in the same spirit as to the principle which he has in view. With respect to his details, I am sorry that I cannot agree with him. They would cause much unnecessary change; and, after all, would not accomplish the object at which he aims. My own plan is, at least, free from the first of these charges: and the reader will judge, whether I am not an advocate for change, when it is really likely to be an improvement. I wish to see the Clergy compelled to do their duty: but I wish also to see the laity hindered from throwing impediments in their way. I wish the latter, as well as the former, to remember, that they belong to *the Church*, and that they stand in need of Reform. In a word, if I thought that Religion would

be a gainer, I would pull down our Cathedrals, and use the materials for building Meeting-houses; but when we had paid the masons for their labour, and had ornamented the country with these simple edifices, would the Church of Christ be more established in these kingdoms?—*I trow not.*

APPENDIX.

I HAVE given at page 25, a graduated scale for the taxation of benefices. A friend, whose opinion is entitled to much more deference than mine, and who has devoted much consideration, as well as judgment to these matters, has furnished me with another calculation, which appears to be constructed upon a most equitable scale, and which few persons would consider too high. He begins with livings of 300*l. per annum*, which he would tax at 1 per cent. i. e. a living of 300*l.* would pay 3*l. per annum*: a living of 400*l.* would be taxed at 2 per cent. and would pay 8*l.*: so that a table would be constructed on the following scale.

Value. £.	Rate.	Payment. £.
300 ———	1 per cent. ———	3
400 ———	2 ———	8
500 ———	3 ———	15
600 ———	4 ———	24
700 ———	5 ———	35
800 ———	6 ———	48
900 ———	7 ———	63
1000 ———	8 ———	80
1100 ———	9 ———	99
1200 ———	10 ———	120

I would make a slight addition to this scheme, by taxing livings of 200*l.* at ten shillings per cent. i. e. at 1*l. per annum*: and if we take the number of livings according to the calculation in page 32, the tax upon parochial benefices, would amount to the following sum.

	£.
Livings from 200 <i>l.</i> to 300 <i>l.</i> to pay . . .	2,142
————— 300 <i>l.</i> to 500 <i>l.</i>	11,990
————— above 500 <i>l.</i>	61,296
	75,428

I have averaged the livings above 500*l.* as before, at 800*l.*: but if this average, as there is good reason to suspect, is too low, the increase in the tax would be much greater upon this scale than upon mine. The whole sum to be paid by parochial and cathedral preferment, would amount to nearly 100,000*l.*

The whole of this pamphlet was ready for the press, before I was aware, that Lord Henley's Plan of Church Reform had appeared in a fourth edition, "with additions." A hasty glance over the additional matter has not led me to alter any thing which I had previously written: but there is one sentence in the Letter to the King, which will probably be read by many persons with regret. After alluding to the reception which the Plan had met with from the public, Lord Henley informs his Majesty—"I can safely assert, that no one whose outward life and conversation evince that pure and peaceable wisdom which comes from above, has ever expressed any disapprobation of the extent to which it is carried. And, I have generally found, that the more spiritual and the more scriptural have been the views of those, who have honoured me with their notice and their communications, the more entire has been their approval of it."

This places persons like myself, who cannot approve of Lord Henley's scheme, in rather an awkward predicament: but, in the name of every thing which is sound in religion and common sense, I must protest against a man's spiritual and scriptural views being decided by his attachment to this or that scheme of Church Reform. If a man is religious, he will be a friend of *real* Reform: but his religion will not hinder him from mistaking the shadow for the substance. The former is a matter of the heart, the latter of the head. Whether Clergymen should

reside among their flocks, and whether sinecures should be abolished, are proper questions to be submitted to persons whose views are spiritual and scriptural: but whether the Cathedral property should be vested in a Board of Commissioners; whether that property amounts to 300,000*l. per annum*; and whether a residue of 150,000*l.* will leave much for small livings, when it is saddled with a payment of 121,085*l.*, these surely are questions, not of religion, but of practical experience and simple arithmetic. I repeat, that these are the questions which are really at issue between us: so that Lord Henley's satisfaction at the religious sentiments of his supporters may be perfectly just, and yet it need not follow that his Plan is a good one.

We may infer from the sentence quoted above, that persons, whose views are spiritual and scriptural, and whose lives are pure and peaceable, approve of "the extent" to which this plan is carried. Let us then consider what is this *extent*. It is, that translations, commendams, pluralities, non-residence, sinecures, &c. &c. should be abolished. But where are the Clergymen who are not willing to go to this extent? I believe that they are very few: and Lord Henley has shewn, that it is the policy of statesmen, as much as the cupidity of Clergymen, which keeps up these abuses. His Lordship will perhaps say, that his Plan goes also to the extent of abolishing several stalls in Cathedrals: but here I am obliged again to advert to the fallacy in his reasoning. The abolition of these stalls is not an end, but a means; and when stalls can be made useful, Lord Henley preserves them. Others are to be abolished, to furnish a sum for the augmentation of small livings: and my objection to the Plan is, that the abolition of these stalls will *not* raise a sum for the augmentation of small livings. Again, I have already observed, that Lord Henley's

Plan, properly so called, makes no provision whatever for the abolition of these stalls: it merely appropriates their revenues, as soon as they are abolished: but the abolition can only be effected by the Crown resigning its patronage: and Lord Henley has himself told us, that “the time is not yet arrived, when we can hope for any legislative enactment respecting it.” So far, therefore, from expressing “any disapprobation of the extent to which it (Lord Henley’s plan) is carried,” I object that it is not carried far enough in restraining statesmen from doing those political jobs, from which the Church suffers so severely, and for which she incurs so much odium, as if she were the offending instead of the suffering party.

I have said thus much, because persons, who have not the religious feeling or the charity of Lord Henley, may be inclined to convert his proposition, and to say of those persons who express disapprobation of his Plan, that their outward life and conversation do not evince that pure and peaceable wisdom which comes from above. My views of the Gospel do not allow me to speak thus of those who differ from me in opinion: if I felt myself inclined to draw such a conclusion, I should repress the thought as uncharitable: and, “I have generally found, that the more spiritual and the more scriptural have been the views of any persons,” the less confident are they in their own conclusions, and the less inclined to judge the consciences of others.

THE END.











